The Farmer's View

A concise discussion of the Proposed Reciprocity Trade Agreement by M. S. Schell, of South Oxford, one of the richest and most prosperous districts in Canada. . . . .

What it means to the people of Canada.

FC553
R4
S3
c.4

THE FARMER'S VIEW.

Never in the history of Canada has there been a more important question placed before us, than the agreement proposing a measure of recipocal trade between Canada and the United States.

The principal feature of the agreement provides for reciprocity in trade in the natural products of each country.

Some attempts were made at first to create an impression that our manufacturing industries would be adversely affected by it.

With the exception of the reduction of duties of from 2½ to 5 per cent. on Agricultural Implements, there is scarcely another manufactured article that is affected by the proposed agreement.

The opposition that was at first supposed to come from the manufacturers, has been found to have come from moneyed and privileged classes in Toronto and Montreal, who are more interested in mergers, combines and large corporations, than in the general welfare of the country.

As the agreement comes to be more fully understood the opposition to it from the manufacturers as an economic question has almost entirely ceased.

Instead of objecting, they now see it will work out to their ultimate advantage.

While it is of primary and vital importance to the farmer, fisherman, lumberman and miner, it is of equal value to all other classes of the country.

Source of All National Wealth.

The soil, the fisheries, the forests, and the mines are the primary and basic foundation of all material wealth and national development.

Anything that aims at a larger or more remunerative return to these primary sources of wealth must of necessity bring increased prosperity to every line of business, every industrial enterprise, and to every citizen of the Country from the highest to the lowest.

While good crops are of the first importance good or remunerative prices are of almost equal importance in contributing to the growth, wealth and general comfort of all classes.

It is also quite as important to **buy cheaply** those things we need to buy as it is to **sell dearly** those products we have to sell.

With these facts in mind it is readily seen how reciprocity in trade makes for the betterment of both buyers and sellers. This does not need any demonstration to the thinking mind.

National Wealth Comes From Surplus Exported.

The increase of wealth as shown in the money that goes into circulation is dependent almost entirely in the final analysis on the surplus products that are exported and exchanged for gold or its equivalent. If those surplus products do not command remunerative prices in the markets of the world, hard times will be the inevitable result.

Our factories will lack orders. Our Banks will close their tills, and our workmen will walk the streets looking for employment. If on the other hand the farmers get a good return for what they have to sell, every dollar goes at once into circulation. They do not hide it in a napkin or bury it in the earth.

They meet their obligations whatever they may be, and if they can afford it they buy more dry goods, groceries, furniture for their homes, implements for their farms, do more underdraining, fencing, putting up better buildings, buying better stock, or giving their children a fair chance in getting an education.

Thus it is seen that every dollar coming to the farmer goes at once into circulation, making for the wealth, comfort and prosperity of all classes, and all lines of business.

There is an interdependence between the tiller of the land, and the laborer in our factories, and between the rural and urban population in every walk of life.

Reciprocity Aim of Both Parties.

For forty-two years the people of Canada have been asking for better and more equitable trade relations with the United States.

In 1868 Sir John A. MacDonald made a special appeal to Washington.

In 1869 and 1871 he made further appeals.

In 1874 Alexander McKenzie sent Hon. George Brown to open negotiations.

In 1879 when Sir John A. MacDonald was again in power he approached Washington, but without success, but to show his good faith embodied a clause in the tariff offering the United States reciprocity in natural products.

In 1891 he prorogued parliament and made reciprocity the basis of his appeal to the electorate.

Following his return to power on that issue he at once despatched Hon. Geo. E. Foster and others to Washington to see if he could not get some measure of free trade.

The present Government on their return to power in 1896 opened negotiations at once but with no better success than their predecessors.

In the light of 30 years of repeated appeals to Washington by both political parties without success, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said he would not go again with "hat in hand" seeking an interview. If

negotiations were ever entered upon the approach would have to be made by the United States Government.

Mr. Fielding in his budget speech on the presentation of his tariff in 1897 made use of these significant words:

"We submit," said Mr. Fielding in 1897, "that it is wiser to wait and see what shall be the outcome of the present uncertainty in the United States in relation to their trade policy, and of the negotiations which we are willing to enter into with respect to reciprocity. It is the part of prudence that we should hold our hands, and not extend to that country the measure of tariff reform which we would be anxious to extend if they would meet us on liberal lines."

In the light of this speech of the Minister of Finance to-day these words seem prophetic, and along those lines he appears to have worked unremittingly. Whatever history may say of the result, William Stephens Fielding stands or falls by his greatest effort.

Government Had Mandate.

From that day down to the opening of this session the Government has been persistently urged by the opposition on the floor of Parliament, on the public platform, and through the press of the Country, to do something to secure better trade relations with the United States.

They said we buy from them $217,000,000 worth, and sell only $104,000,000, showing a balance of trade of $113,000,000 a year against us. This they said should not be.

With all the arguments at their command they said the Government should try and get better entrance to their markets for what we have to sell, so that our trade would more nearly balance.

Only December last Hon. George E. Foster, writing for one of our magazines, advocated reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. Northrop, one of the chief Opposition front benchers in speaking on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne at the opening of this Session, said if we could only secure reciprocity in natural products, they (the Conservative party) would hold up both hands for it.

Dr. Chisholm, the Conservative member for East Huron, also speaking on the address in the same debate, in the clearest and most emphatic language supported the views so clearly and forcibly expressed by Mr. Northrop. See what Dr. Chisholm said:

"Personally, I would favour reciprocity if I thought we could get a fair deal. The very word 'reciprocity' implies fair dealing, even-handed justice, with no selfish or dishonorable advantage taken by either party. In fact, reciprocity has been defined as a condition of things in which equal rights and mutual benefits are given and received. Now according to that definition, the very first step towards reciprocity between Canada and the United States

should consist in an equalization of the present tariff rates between the two countries. If the United States will only do this, and thus put themselves in a position to begin negotiations on a proper basis, I feel satisfied that Canadians, irrespective of party, will support any just and reasonable tariff arrangements which this government may make."

That is exactly what was secured, and arranged for under the proposed agreement.

Spending Large Sums of Money Looking for New Markets.

We have nineteen trade agents in various parts of the world looking for better markets for us, in which both to buy and sell, costing us nearly $125,000 annually. We also spend over $800,000 each year in steamship subsidies to foster trade with foreign countries not including Great Britain. If it is a wise policy, and it is recognized to be, to cultivate trade with China, Japan, Mexico, Russia, Germany, France and many other countries thousands of miles away, at such large expense, what folly it would be to refuse to extend our trade with our nearest neighbor and by far our best customer, when we have the best offer ever made to any country. It would simply be criminal and suicidal to do so.

If we had refused to negotiate or accept the offers made, those now objecting would have condemned the Government in the most scathing terms.

How The Agreement was Received.

When Mr. Fielding made his statement to the House on Jan. 26th, giving the terms of the proposed agreement, as he mentioned item after item of our natural products which were to be admitted free into the U. S., the applause from the Opposition members was repeated time and again, showing their hearty appreciation of the splendid bargain which had been effected.

The Toronto News, the strongest newspaper now opposing the agreement, in its leading editorial on the 27th of January, the day following the announcement of the terms of the agreement made by the Finance Minister, used these significant words:—"It amounts practically to Free Trade in natural products between Canada and the United States.

"It means a second market for Canadian farmers. It means that the prices of Canadian products will be determined by the American market.

"It means if expectations are realized that Canadian farmers at certain seasons will receive better prices for at least a part of what they produce.

"It is not so certain that there will be any such average increase in agricultural prices as has been predicted, but that access to the American market for some of our products will mean higher prices for the producers is a reasonable expectation. It is important to face the facts fairly and to admit the full force of the argu-

ments by wh' . ny farmers are influenced.

"The west will welcome a free American market for wheat and oats.

"Undoubtedly the farmers of Ontario desire the removal of American customs duties on live stock, dairy products, vegetables, eggs and other articles covered by the agreement.

"Quebec will be interested in a free market for hay, vegetables and dairy products. Free fish will be a strong attraction to the Maritime Provinces. Unquestionably, therefore, the arrangement will command strong support from Canadian producers, and as has been said nothing else could have been expected.

"Under all the circumstances we (The News) recognize that Washington has offered terms which it is difficult for Canada to reject."

The London, England, Daily Graphic said, referring to the trade agreement:—"We may safely assume that mutual affection between us is undiminished by the commercial arrangement, and the prosperity to the Dominion."

The London Times says editorially:—"We cannot tell how far the sporadically raised cry of annexation is influencing Canadian opinion, but there is no reason to suppose that the reciprocity agreement would produce any tendency in that direction.

"On the contrary, bargaining on equal terms with the United States might tend to foster rather than diminish the self reliance and independence of the Canadian People."

The Kingston Standard (Conservative) says:—

"Is free access to a great market like the United States not as desirable to Canada as access to any of the other markets for which we have so long contended?

"If our farmers can sell more goods at higher prices than ever in their history is this privilege to be denied them merely because it is offered by our next door neighbor?

"Are we so skeptical of our own loyalty Great Britain that we cannot trust ourselves to enter into closer commercial relations with a neighbor, lest thereby we be weaned away from the mother country? Is it of such stuff as this we are made, that it is feared we will sell our birthright for a mess of pottage?"

The foregoing testimony coming from the sources quoted should be sufficient to convince the most skeptical that Reciprocity will be a good thing for Canada.

Terms of Agreement.

What does the agreement provide for?

The principal feature of the proposed agreement provides for reciprocal trade in practically all the natural products of our soil, fisheries, forests and mines. That is, it gives Canadians a market of 90 millions of people for what we have to sell, while we give a market of 8 millions for what the United States have to sell us.

Taking our exports and imports of products for 1910 dealt with under the agreement, as basis of calculation we find we paid the U. S. Government in duties $4,850,000 on our exports, and the Dominion Government collected duties to the amount of $2,302,000 on our imports from the U. S.

It is safe to say that under reciprocity Canada would get increased prices on products we have to sell to the extent of the larger portion of the duties collected by the U. S. Government. It is also certain that the Canadian consumers of the products imported would save the larger portion of the duties collected by our own government.

The remission of duties as shown by last year's trade returns should be sufficient to convince any candid mind that free trade will result in great benefits to both the producers and the consumers of our natural products.

The exact benefits that will accrue to each must always be determined by the question of supply and demand. If the supply is limited and the market large, the seller will almost invariably receive the preponderance of benefit.

If on the other hand the supply is large and the market small or limited, the buyer or consumer will receive the larger portion of duties remitted. Thus it is clear that Canada stands to gain in both respects. Think it out for yourselves.

This was clearly admitted by Mr. Ames, the Conservative member for Montreal, when raising the bugaboo of future contingencies he said, "What would be the worst loss we could inflict upon them?

"It would be to take away a market of from eight to ten millions of people; while the loss they could inflict on us would be to take away a market of ninety or a hundred millions of people on certain commodities which at that time had begun to flow in that direction."

Past Trade Answers Objections.

Let us look briefly at some of our exports to the U.S. during 1910.

By a mistake in the Payne Aldrich tariff in 1908, Cream from Canada was charged a duty of only 5 cents per gallon, instead of 5 cents per lb., as they intended. This low duty gave us nearly a free entrance on that commodity. What was the result? In 1910 we sent $1,660,000 worth to their markets, which netted our farmers of Ontario and Quebec 25 per cent. more than they could have obtained for their milk from the cheese factories. That is in round figures $400,000 clear gain, besides having the skim milk to feed on their farms.

This is a clear concrete case of the benefits of the United States markets for what they want to buy from us. This one example should satisfy every candid mind as to the immense benefits that will accrue to Canada. This one item proves the case beyond con-

troversy. But let us prove the case further by some statistics of exports to the United States with duties charged for 1910.

Shipment	Value	Rate of Duty	Total Duties
Horses	$453,186.....	$30.00 on each horse valued at $150 or less; 25 per cent. on a horse worth more than $150.00	$ 121,140
Sheep	$569,679.....	$1.50 each for sheep 75 cts. each for lamb	$ 103,519
Cattle	$642,674.....	27½ per cent.	$ 27,443
Poultry	$111,241.....	Live 3 cts. per lb. Dressed 5 cts. per lb.	$ 38,990
Wheat and Flour	$2,455,585.....	25 cts. per bush	$ 135,273
Oats	$534,692.....	15 cts. per bush.	$ 141,972
Flax Seed & Linseed	$1,256,436.....	25 cts. per bush.	$ 353,158
Peas	$347,308.....	25 cts. per bush.	$ 58,140
Barley	$ 66,608.....	30 cts. per bush.	$ 44,278
Potatoes	$345,903.....	25 cts. per bush.	$ 169,658
Vegetables	$334,804.....	25 per cent.	$ 160,570
Hay	$673,220.....	$4.00 per ton	$ 386,028
Apples	$132,810.....	75 cts. per barrel	$ 10,903
Butter	$199,854.....	6 cts. per lb.	$ 58,802
Cheese	$ 23,995.....	6 cts. per lb.	$ 9,801
Cream	$1,660,000.....	5 cts. per gal.	$ 36,588
Eggs	$ 11,551.....	5 cts. per doz.	$ 1,786
Lumber & Lumber products	$23,927,619.....	125 per 1000 ft.	$1,219,970
Fish	$4,627,051.....	1 ct. per lb.	$ 511,482
Total duties paid on above products in 1910			$3,589,501

The foregoing is a partial list only of goods sent to U.S. in 1910.

Practical Experience Best Test.

How any person can look over this partial list of farm products exported to the United States for one year only, against a very high tariff, on some articles almost prohibitive, paying duties amounting to $3,589,501, and have the slightest doubt as to the great advantages that would accrue to us by having these duties entirely removed is simply incomprehensible. No man in his right senses would take that position.

I would ask a careful consideration of these shipments, and what it would mean to us if we had a free entrance on all these products to the great cities of the United States.

There is not a single article or product which we have for sale but would be more or less enhanced in value, in some years or at some seasons of the year. .

Some say England is our best market. To a certain extent that is true, but not at all times, nor on all commodities with no

duties to pay. We sell her very few horses or sheep. Her prices on poultry and eggs are now away too low to induce shipments. Potatoes, turnips and sugar beets are not wanted from us by England. The cheese and butter market was not nearly so good during a large portion of the last two years as the United States.

The resolutions passed in favor of reciprocity at both the Eastern and Western Ontario Dairymen's Conventions at their annual meetings this last winter is the best proof how they felt on the question. Every Agricultural paper, every Farmers' Organization, and practically every Stock Breeders' Association throughout the Dominion is out and out in favor of the agreement.

Conclusive Evidence.

Why is Ontario fall wheat 10 cents per bushel cheaper in Toronto than it is in Buffalo? Take away the 25 cts. per bushel duty and they will buy our white winter wheat for making cereal foods. The best malting barley has been selling in Toronto for 60 to 67 cts. per bushel, while in Buffalo the same grade is selling for 95 cts. to $1.00 per bushel. Remove the duty of 30 cts. per bushel and we should get nearly the Buffalo price.

From 1876 to 1892, seventeen years—we sold to the United States 135,250,000 bushels of barley for the large sum of $90,000,000. During the next seventeen years under the high tariff of the U. S. we sold in round figures 7,000,000 bushels for only $3,000,000. During 1882 our exports of barley were 11,557,000 bushels which netted us the sum of $10,105,000, or an average price of 88 cts. per bushel. In 1910 our shipments were only 147,506 bushels, which netted us but $64,943, an average price of only 44 cts. per bushel. This went largely from our Canadian Northwest.

We want to raise barley as a crop for rotation and seeding with clover. Give us the better price and we will sell our barley to good advantage, and if we want grain to feed we can buy U.S. free corn at a much less price per bushel, and 8 lbs. more weight per bushel, and thus make from $5.00 to $10.00 more per acre from our barley thus handled.

Paris, Drumbo, Bright, Princeton, Eastwood and other stations receive many thousands of bushels of turnips annually for shipment to the U. S. for table use. Remove the duty of 25 per cent., equal to 3 to 4 cents per bushel, and it will mean many tens of thousands of dollars more annually on this one product. Our climate seems to produce a much finer, more crisp and better quality for table use than can be grown by our competitors. Let us have the free market, and we will get better prices and it will stimulate production enormously.

Good for Cheese Industry.

Dr. Charles Publow, a graduate of Queen's University, an expert dairyman, and until six months ago a lecturer on the staff of

the Agricultural College at Cornell University, says:—"So far as cheese is concerned, and I am interested mainly in that product, there is no doubt that reciprocity will prove beneficial to the Canadian farmer.

Prices That Tell.

"For evidence," said Dr. Publow look at the scale of prices offered by Borden's for this year throughout the States. The Borden Condensed Milk Company of New York are the biggest milk firm in the United States. They offer per cwt. as follows: April, $1.50; May, $1.25; June, $1.10; July, $1.30; August, $1.45; September, $1.55. How do these prices compare with an average of 85 cents per cwt. in Ontario last year?" asked Dr. Publow.

"It is a wrong argument," said Dr. Publow, "to say that the United States is a large exporter of cheese to Britain. The United States does not ship her good cheese to any place. The old country market will not warrant higher than 11½ cents per pound for cheese, while for the best grades on the New York Exchange 14½ to 15 cents per pound is offered.

With American cheese at fifteen cents per pound and Canadian at twelve cents per pound," said Dr. Publow, "you can easily see how 100 pounds of milk in the United States is worth fifty-seven cents more than it is in Canada."

In the interview Dr. Publow further said, "I have yet to hear of a real argument against free trade in farm products with the United States."

Good For The Horse Trade.

That we sold $453,186 worth of horses to the U. S. in 1910 and paid $121,140 of duty to get into that market should satisfy any candid mind that we would be immensely benefitted to have a free entrance to their big cities.

A comparison of prices at the present time and for the last 20 years shows that horses are dearer there than here, and always have been.

What Best Breeders and Dealers Say.

A. M. Polley of Goderich, one of the oldest and best known men in the horse business in Western Ontario, with a large experience in shipping both to the Canadian Northwest and the United States says:—"Reciprocity will be a good thing for the horse trade." With a full knowledge of the West he says, "Vancouver is the only really first-class market in Western Canada, and it is too far away."

"The opening of the markets of the Eastern States," Mr. Polley says, "will prove the salvation of the horse raising industry in the Province. From New York, Boston, Philadelphia and other Eastern cities will come a constant demand for horses of the kind that Ontario breeds."

Mr. Wm. Parkinson of Haldimand County says:—"The

market for horses in the United States can trim our market to a frazzle.

"I shipped horses to Buffalo and Philadelphia last year. I bought them here, paid duty and freight on them and cleared as much as $000.00 on the sale." These were both heavy draught horses and roadsters.

Mr. R. R. Pinkerton of North Colchester, noted as a breeder of pure bred Clydesdales, thinks reciprocity will be a good thing. He says "Detroit is the natural market for the horses from Essex County."

Mr. J. O. Duke of Kent County says:—"Not a season passes but some of our horses find their way to the markets of Detroit, Cleveland and Toledo even in the face of a duty of $50.00 to $00.00 a head."

Senator Beath of Bowmanville, one of our largest and most successful importers and breeders of Clydesdales and Hackneys says "Reciprocity will be a great boon to the Canadian Horse trade, and we can't get it too soon."

The Canadian Farm and Dairy in its issue of April 13th gives an account of a public auction sale of horses just held in New York.

In all there were 41 horses sold, which included a lot of breeding stock of unproven value, and they fetched the total sum of $51,565, or an average of $1258.00 per head.

This is the Canadian Farmer's Opportunity. Will he avail himself of it?

Apples are Often Wanted.

We sold last year to the United States $ 32,810 worth of apples, which cost us 75 cents per brl. for duty alone. In 1908 we sold $317,004 worth, in face of the high duty to be paid. They always want Greenings, at good prices, while in the European and Canadian Northwestern markets, they are not wanted at anything like their full value. Mr. J. G. Anderson, who bought about 30,000 barrels of the output of the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association last year sold his Greenings to go to Chicago, paying 75 cts. per barrel duty.

Mr. J. E. Johnston, the manager ever since the Association has been formed, had 6,000 barrels on hand, over and above Mr. Anderson's purchase. These he sold to go to the U. S. markets. In 1908, also, their sales were largely to the U. S., at very high prices. He knows the fruit trade in every aspect. As a grower and handler of all kinds of fruit, there is no better authority, and although he is a Conservative in politics, he is out and out for Reciprocity, because of what it will mean to our fruit industry.

The "Canadian Canneries," one of the many large mergers that we now have in Canada, were bitterly opposed to the agreement when first made public. They professed great solicitude for the fruit growers. It is now known that they are making contracts

for various kinds of fruit and tomatoes at quite an advance over any former years. It is plain to be seen they were afraid our growers might be making sales for their fruit and tomatoes to American buyers. Fruit lands in the Niagara District have already increased in value in prospect of the larger market. Give us the large cities of the U. S. and we will find sale for all the first-class fruit we can grow.

Sifton says Prices are Highest in U. S.

See his own words:—"There is the question of Cattle, and that is one question in respect of which there is no doubt that the farmer will get a benefit under this agreement, for the present at least. It is only a short time since the country was sufficiently settled to have a sufficient production to organize this business. In fact we have hardly got to that point yet. The result is that there is at the present time a very poor market for cattle in Western Provinces. The best creamery butter sells at a higher price in the United States. In poultry the higher grades will be higher. As far as eggs are concerned the prices of the better grades are higher. Hay is the one product that is substantially higher. Barley is higher."

Although Mr. Sifton opposed the agreement he was compelled to admit the higher prices paid in U. S. markets for our products.

Would Pay Three Cents Per Bushel Subsidy on Wheat.

After opposing the agreement, Mr. Ames, Conservative, Member from Montreal, used these words:—"I for my part would rather see a bonus of two or three cents a bushel on wheat paid to the Canadian farmers than to see that grain going to the United States."

Canada will probably produce 200 million bushels of wheat inside of two years—Perhaps even this year—or 300 million bushels inside of five years and 500 million bushels inside of fifteen years.

At three cents per bushel bonus, we would pay $9,000,000 on the 300 million bushel crop.

If we pay it on wheat why not on oats, barley and flax, which would mean another $9,000,000? If on grain crops, why not also on live stock, hay, potatoes and other products? Just think where it would lead us. See what lengths opponents of the agreement will go to! What absurdity.

The great Farmers' Delegation, nearly 1,000 strong, says, give us the free market—that is what we want. We can compete successfully against the world in the products of our farms. We have the soil, we have the climate and we have the men. Two markets and two buyers are always better than one.

Look Now At What We Buy From U. S.

First look at some of the natural products which we buy, and which the Canadian Government allows in free of duty:

Anthracite Coal	$15,980,000	worth
Raw Cotton	9,360,000	"
Corn	4,000,000	"
Lumber	8,000,000	"

Fruits	3,761,000	"
Oils of various kinds	2,204,000	"
Binder Twine	1,750,000	"
Hides and Skins	1,760,000	"
Manilla Hemp	1,130,000	"
Furs and manufactures of	3,013,000	"
Farm Seeds	1,000,000	"

The above are a few of the items now on the free list, the United States does not refuse to sell us of their natural resources.

They do not even put on an export duty. Think what it might mean to us if they refu d to sell us hard coal which we all use in our homes. Or raw cotton which our factories must have to keep their business going—yet some "little Canadians" say don't sell to the U. S. There could not be any more suicidal policy so long as they are willing to pay more than we can get in any other market. Or take soft coal, which now comes in at a duty of fifty-three cents per ton, but which under the agreement is to be reduced to forty-five cents per ton, and which rate the U. S. is only to charge on our soft coal going to them.

It is claimed we have enough soft coal area to last for two thousand years. Why not make the exchange when it pays us both to do so?

We bought last year of soft coal and coke, $14,445,000; iron and steel and manufactures of, $39,600,000, which was charged a very low duty by our own government; early fruits, $2,666,000, which are now to be put on the free list by our government; lard and pork, $3,004,657, which carried a duty of two cents per pound but is proposed to be charged one and a quarter cents per pound duty both ways. The United States Government have been charging a prohibitive duty on meat products. They now say you can sell to us all you wish under the same rate of duty that you impose upon our goods, viz.: one and a quarter cents per pound.

Manufacturers Trade Most With the U. S.—Why Not Farmers Also If Prices Are Better?

Manufactured goods exported in 1910:

To United States	$15,350,280
To United Kingdom	6,610,756
To All Other Countries	9,533,880

It will thus be seen that nearly half of their total export trade was done with the United States. Their purchases of raw material annually amounts to well up to $100,000,000 or more than twice as much as from all other countries from which they buy. If their royalty is not hurt, why should they not be willing to give the farmers the same privilege?

The annexation cry was an insult to every true Britisher and no honest person would continue to use such a baseless imputation. The best people had more self respect than to ever use it.

Hard Pressed to Make a Case Against The Agreement.

Nearly every argument put up against the Agreement is based on the assumption that our trade would increase with the U.S.

As we still have every other market we ever had and have the choice of markets the only inducement to trade with the U. S. would be more remunerative prices for what we have to sell.

They said it would smash our loyalty—That it would interfere with our trade east and west—That it would hurt our railways and not give them all our products for the long haul east and west—That it was the thin end of the wedge—That when the farmers got a taste of the benefits they would want more.

If these things were to happen what was to be the cause? What would bring these conditions?

Better prices and inducements to trade—Simply this and nothing more.

English Markets Often Oversupplied.

The strongest of all arguments from a Canadian point of view is the fact that the imports of food stuffs by England are about the same as they were ten years ago.

Their population of forty-five millions is not large enough to absorb the food products pouring into that market. Only shippers know the serious losses sustained during recent years through glutting the British market.

Their imports of wheat and flour for 1910, reducing the flour to its equivalent in wheat was only 193 million bushels. Russia was the largest shipper. Other countries exported in the following order, India, Canada, The Argentine, Australia and New Zealand, and the United States.

Canada's wheat crop in 1909 was 165 million bushels. If the area under crop this year yields equal to 1909 we should have considerably over 200 million bushels. This it will be seen is more than the whole of England's imports of wheat from all the countries last year.

It is estimated that Canada in five years will produce at least 300 to 400 million bushels. When even these figures are looked at, no argument is needed to convince any candid mind the need of our looking for another market.

The same argument applies to nearly every other farm product depending on England for its market.

United States Becoming Large Buyers.

Over against this is the fact that the U. S. is increasing population at a most rapid rate. In 1880 it had less than 50 millions. Now it has over 90 millions. They are also increasing at the rate of nearly two millions per year.

Their exports of many kinds of food products have nearly ceased. This is absolutely true of cheese and butter.

In 1878 their exports of cheese from New York were 145,486,-

910 lbs. In 1910 they fell to 2,276,343 lbs. Of butter in 1878, 38,464,753 lbs. In 1910, 1,958,550. The British Board of Trade give the U. S. wheat shipments for 1909 as less than 17 million bushels.

It will be a great surprise to many to know that in the fiscal years 1908 and 1909, the United States bought and imported for their own use from the United Kingdom, $2,750,000.00 worth of potatoes. Look again at the list of our exports of natural products given on page 8 in this pamphlet and satisfy yourself that the United States is the market we should cultivate when we have the opportunity. Refuse it now and it may never come again on such favorable terms.

Rural Population of Ontario Decreasing.

The Department of Agriculture in Ontario has issued a report in which they claim that the rural population of the Province has decreased 60,000 during the last twenty years and that the urban population has increased nearly 295,000 during the same period. This is a serious condition of things and shows that farming even in this Banner Province is not as remunerative as it should be. Farmers and farmers' sons would not leave the farm if the conditions were equally as favorable as those of our towns and cities.

Let us not forget that no growth of cities or increase of wealth can compensate for any loss in either the number or the character of our rural population. We of all others should recognize this.

A peculiar dependence has been placed on the farmers in the past and that dependence has been justified. It cannot be justified if agriculture is permitted to sink in the scale as compared to other employments. The primary and chief object of the Reciprocity Agreement is to get for us a second market free of tariff obstructions. If it proves a benefit we can use it. If not every market we have to-day is still ours. We will be absolutely free to choose where we will buy or sell.

If after giving it a trial we wish to make any change whatever, a clause is inserted in the agreement by which we can do so at our own pleasure without any reference to the U. S.

I would ask you to preserve this statement of the case. It is prepared with much care to put the question fairly.

Study the arguments in each paragraph. Study our exports, of which we give a partial list as examples to show what we are now selling.

Study the rates of duty now charged.

Study the large sums of money the U.S. government are now charging us as duties for what we are selling to them.

Consider what it will mean to save these high duties, and have free access to their larger markets.

Then think what the voters of Canada would have said, had the Government neglected this great opportunity to better the conditions of the people.

MALCOLM S. SCHELL.